Anyon Zitterbewegung

Subir Ghosh
Physics Department,
Dinabandhu Andrews College,
Calcutta 700084, India.

Abstract
A new model for anyon is proposed, which exhibits the classical analogue of the quantum phenomenon - Zitterbewegung. The model is derived from existing spinning particle model and retains the essential features of anyon in the non-relativistic limit.

PACS number(s): 11.10.Kk, 11.10.Ef, 03.20.+i, 11.10.Qr, 14.60.Cd

In this Letter, we present a new Spinning Particle Model (SPM) in 2+1-dimensions, which is capable of producing a classical analogue of the well-known quantum phenomenon - Zitterbewegung [1]. Recently it has been demonstrated [2], in the context of existing SPM of anyon [3, 4], that this oscillation in 2+1-dimensions is a gauge artifact and can be gauged away with appropriate gauge fixing. Hence this effect was thought to be reserved for 3+1-dimensional particles. We will show that in a close variant of the established SPM this effect can indeed show up, while the new model retains the essential anyonic characteristics of the parent model, under certain plausible approximations. Also the present scheme can pave the way for simulating various interactions.

Our starting model is relativistic, but for greater transparancy we have gauge fixed the reparametrization invariance, thus losing manifest relativistic covariance. The final results are obtained in the low energy and heavy particle limit. We have closely followed the classic work of Barut and Zanghi [5] in spirit. The analysis is carried through in the Lagrangean framework.

It should be pointed out that after the original success of Chern-Simons construction [6] of anyon, theorists are more and more opting for the SPMs of anyon [7]. Removal of the Chern-Simons statistical gauge field and the induced "side effects" [8] in the former option has remained a long standing problem, whereas the economical and direct approach in the latter framework [7, 4] has obvious attractions.

Let us briefly describe the parent anyon model [4],

$$\mathcal{L} = (M^2\dot{x}^\mu\dot{x}_\mu + \frac{J^2}{2}\sigma^{\mu\nu}\sigma_{\mu\nu} + MJ\epsilon^{\mu\nu\lambda}\dot{x}_\mu\sigma_{\nu\lambda})^{\frac{1}{2}}, \tag{1}$$

where M and J are the mass and (arbitrary) spin parameters and

$$\dot{x}^\mu = \frac{dx^\mu}{d\tau}; \quad \sigma^{\mu\nu} = \Lambda_\lambda{}^\mu \frac{d\Lambda^{\lambda\nu}}{d\tau}; \quad \Lambda_\lambda{}^\mu\Lambda^{\lambda\nu} = \Lambda^\mu{}_\lambda\Lambda^{\nu\lambda} = g^{\mu\nu}; \quad g^{00} = -g^{11} = -g^{22} = 1.$$

Hamiltonian analysis at once reveals that

$$(-\frac{\partial\mathcal{L}}{\partial\dot{x}_\mu})^2 \equiv p^\mu p_\mu = M^2; \quad (-\frac{\partial\mathcal{L}}{\partial\sigma_{\mu\nu}})^2 \equiv S^{\mu\nu}S_{\mu\nu} = 2J^2; \quad \frac{1}{2}\epsilon^{\mu\nu\lambda}S_{\mu\nu}p_\lambda = MJ,$$

where $S^{\mu\nu}$ is the relativistic spin. These relations ensure the generic "rigid" dynamics, where spin and momentum vectors are directly related [4, 7]. We rewrite $\mathcal{L}$ to remove the square root,

$$\mathcal{L} = \frac{1}{4\psi}(\dot{x}^\mu + \frac{J}{2M}\epsilon^{\mu\nu\lambda}\sigma_{\nu\lambda})(\dot{x}_\mu + \frac{J}{2M}\epsilon_{\mu\alpha\beta}\sigma^{\alpha\beta}) + \psi M^2, \tag{2}$$

and finally replace the inverse auxiliary field ψ,

$$\mathcal{L} = -(\dot{x}_\mu + \frac{J}{2M}\epsilon_{\mu\alpha\beta}\sigma^{\alpha\beta})A^\mu - (A^\mu A_\mu)\psi + M^2\psi, \tag{3}$$

A^μ being another auxiliary field. From the equations of motion, we rewrite $\mathcal{L}$ as

$$\mathcal{L} = -\dot{x}^\mu p_\mu - \frac{1}{2}\sigma^{\mu\nu}S_{\mu\nu} - \psi(p^2 - M^2), \tag{4}$$

where we have renamed $p_\mu = -\frac{\partial\mathcal{L}}{\dot{x}^\mu} = A_\mu$ and $S_{\mu\nu} = -\frac{\partial\mathcal{L}}{\partial\sigma^{\mu\nu}} = \frac{J}{M}\epsilon_{\mu\nu\lambda}A^\lambda$.

However, an equivalent and more convenient form of Lagrangean is the following [3],

$$L = -\dot{x}^\mu p_\mu - \dot{n}^\mu P_\mu - \frac{\lambda}{2}(n^2+1) - \lambda_1(p_\mu n^\mu) - \lambda_2(p_\mu P^\mu) - \Lambda(p^2 - M^2). \qquad (5)$$

Note that the canonically conjugate spin variables $(n^\mu,\ P_\nu)$, together with the constraints coupled to the multipliers λ, λ_1 and λ_2, are lumped into the previous non-canonical conjugate variables $(\sigma^{\mu\nu},\ S_{\mu\nu})$. The details are provided in [4].

It should be pointed out that two definitions of total angular momentum,

$$-\epsilon_{\mu\nu\lambda}(x^\nu p^\lambda + n^\nu P^\lambda)\ and\ -(\epsilon_{\mu\nu\lambda}x^\nu p^\lambda + J\frac{p_\mu}{\sqrt{p^2}})$$

are equivalent as far as angular momentum algebra and constraints are concerned. However, due to the involved Dirac Bracket algebra, on the constraint surface, a direct identification between $-\epsilon_{\mu\nu\lambda}n^\nu P^\lambda$ and $-J\frac{p_\mu}{\sqrt{p^2}}$ is not allowed with reference to the *full* gauge invariant sector [9]. The former relation is the natural choice for (5), whereas the latter relation agrees with the relations derived from (1).

The system of equations of motion and constraints resulting from (5) can be solved easily to yield,

$$\dot{x}^\mu = -2\Lambda p^\mu;\ \ \dot{p}^\mu = 0;\ \ \dot{n}^\mu = 0;\ \ \dot{P}^\mu = \lambda n^\mu;\ \ \lambda_1 = \lambda_2 = 0. \qquad (6)$$

The multipliers λ and Λ corresponding to the first class constraints remain undetermined. The natural choice of gauge, $x_0 = \tau$ (proper time) gives $\Lambda = -\frac{1}{2p_0}$ and one obtains the solution $x_i(\tau) = \frac{p_i}{p_0}\tau +\ constant$, consistent with the free motion with constant velocity [3].

This analysis clearly shows that in this model, any oscillation in the x- coordinate has to be trivial, since for the conventional parametrization of x_0 as above, it is absent.

Our aim is to modify (5) judiciously such that in the same gauge as above, (ie. $x_0 = \tau$), an extra oscillation is superimposed on the free motion of x_i. But at the same time it is imperative to enforce the constraints present in (5), so that the spinning particle properties are preserved. The new Lagrangean is,

$$L_z = L - a\epsilon^{\mu\nu\lambda}P_\mu n_\nu p_\lambda, \qquad (7)$$

where a is a numerical parameter.

The Lagrangean equations corresponding to $(p,\ x,\ P,\ n)$ are respectively,

$$\dot{x}^\mu = -2\Lambda p^\mu - \lambda_1 n^\mu - \lambda_2 P^\mu - a\epsilon^{\mu\nu\lambda}P_\nu n_\lambda,$$

$$\dot{p}^\mu = 0,$$

$$\dot{n}^\mu = -\lambda_2 p^\mu - a\epsilon^{\mu\nu\lambda}n_\nu P_\lambda,$$

$$\dot{P}^\mu = \lambda n^\mu + \lambda_1 p^\mu - a\epsilon^{\mu\nu\lambda}P_\nu p_\lambda. \qquad (8)$$

Notice that the four constraints connected to $\Lambda,\ \lambda,\ \lambda_1$ and λ_2 remain unchanged. Using the equations of motion, time persistance of the constraints on the constraint surface, determines $\lambda_1 = 0$, (from $\frac{d(p^\mu P_\mu)}{d\tau} = 0$) and $\lambda_2 = -\frac{a}{m^2}\epsilon^{\mu\nu\lambda}p_\mu n_\nu P_\lambda$, from (from $\frac{d(p_\mu n^\mu)}{d\tau} = 0$). Time derivatives of the remaining constraints are identically satisfied.

Now we fix the gauge $x_0 = \tau$ to determine Λ,

$$\Lambda = -\frac{1}{2p_0}(1 + \lambda_2 P_0 + a\epsilon_{ij} P^i n^j). \tag{9}$$

Lastly the gauge choice $P_0 =$ *constant* fixes λ,

$$\lambda = \frac{a}{n_0}\epsilon_{ij} P^i p^j. \tag{10}$$

Finally we restrict ourselves to the non-relativistic limit, $\frac{p_i}{M} \approx 0$ and $p_0 \approx M$, which makes $\lambda_2 \approx 0$. Incorporating all the above informations into (8), we obtain,

$$\dot{x}^i \approx -2\Lambda p^i - a n_0 \epsilon^{ij} P_j; \quad \dot{P}^i \approx \lambda n^i - aM\epsilon^{ij} P_j,$$

$$\dot{n}_0 \approx -a\epsilon^{ij} n_i P_j; \quad \dot{n}^i \approx a n_0 \epsilon^{ij} P_j. \tag{11}$$

In the above set of equations, we can still drop the λ-term, (since it contains p_i whereas the other term in the $\dot{P}_i$ equation has M), and reduce $\Lambda \approx -\frac{1}{2p_0}$, (since in the $\dot{x}^i$ equation we neglect $\mid \frac{ap_i}{M} \mid$ for small values of a). Thus the two all-important equations, for our present purpose, are,

$$\dot{x}^i \approx -\frac{2p^i}{M} - a n_0 \epsilon^{ij} P_j; \quad \dot{P}^i \approx -aM\epsilon^{ij} P_j. \tag{12}$$

Clearly the behaviour of the spin variable P_i is reminiscent of the Barut-Zanghi construction [5]. Rewriting the P_i equations in terms of $P_\pm = P_i \pm iP_2$, we find $\ddot{P}_\pm = -(aM)^2 P_\pm$, which introduces an oscillatory term of frequency aM in the $\dot{x}_i$ equation. Note that the frequency depends on M in the correct way. This is the Zitterbewegung we were looking for.

There are other interesting applications in our proposed modification in (7). The a term in (7) can be treated as an interaction term by replacing one of the particle degrees of freedom by an external c-number function field or by a suitable combination of another particle's coordinates. The equations of motion will obviously change. The advantage of the present scheme is that at every step one can adjust the parameters so that the fundamental anyonic behaviour is kept intact as much as possible.

References

[1] E. Schrödinger, Sitzungsber. Preuss. Akad. Wiss. Phys. Math. **K1. 24**, 418 (1930).

[2] I. V. Gorbunov, S. M. Kuzenko and S. L. Lyakhovich, Preprint hep-th/**9607114**; S. M. Kuzenko, S. L. Lyakhovich and A. Yu. Segal, Int. J. Mod. Phys. **A10**, 1529 (1995).

[3] R. Jackiw and V. P. Nair, Phys. Rev. Lett. **73**, 2007 (1994); M. Chaichian, F. Gonzalez Felipe and D. Lois Martinez, Phys. Rev. Lett. **71**, 3407 (1993); **73**, 2009(E) (1994).

[4] S. Ghosh, Phys. Lett. **B338**, 235 (1994); Phys. Rev. **D51**, 5827 (1995).

[5] A. O. Barut and N. Zanghi, Phys. Rev. Lett. **52**, 2009 (1984).

[6] F. Wilczek, *Fractional Statistics and Anyon Superconductivity*, (World Scientific, Singapore, 1990).

[7] R. Jackiw and V. P. Nair, Phys. Rev. **D43**, 1933 (1991); M. S. Plyushchay, Phys. Lett. **B262**, 71 (1991); C. Chou, V. P. Nair and A. P. Polychronakos, Phys. Lett. **B304**, 105 (1991).

[8] R. Jackiw and S-Y. Pi, Phys. Rev. **D42**, 3500 (1990).

[9] N. Banerjee, R. Banerjee and S. Ghosh, Phys. Rev. **D54**, 1719 (1996).